



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,203	04/27/2007	Harold T. Woods	WIC-115-A (0062P-35US)	7254
84593	7590	06/07/2011		
Whitesell International Corporation				
401 E. Tuscaloosa Street				
Florence, AL 35630				
EXAMINER				
OMCBA, ESSAMA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3726				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/07/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/594,203

Applicant(s)

WOODS, HAROLD T.

Examiner

ESSAMA OMGBA

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-41 and 43-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-41 and 43-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 39 and 47 is withdrawn in view of the reference to Pamer et al. (US Patent 4,785,529). Rejections based on the reference follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 28-31, 33-35, 37-40, 43, 45, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamer et al. (US Patent 4,785,529) in view of Krcek et al. (US Patent 6,401,507).

With regards to claims 28, 38, 39 and 47, Pamer et al. discloses a pierce nut installation apparatus for installing pierce nuts into a panel, the apparatus comprising a pierce nut installation head having a plunger 50 for receiving a pierce nut 15 for installation into the panel 56, the plunger reciprocating in the plunger passage having a proximal end driving the pierce nuts through the plunger passage into the panel piercing a slug 58 from the panel thereby forming an opening in the panel and installing the pierce nut into the opening in the panel left by the slug (this is conventional in the art), the plunger having an axial opening telescopically receiving a slug probe rod 86 resiliently biased toward the proximal end of the plunger and extending beyond the

proximal end of the plunger through the bore disposed in the pierce nut thereby ensuring a slug is pierced from the panel, the slug probe interacting with the slug pierced from the panel and ejecting the slug from the lower installation assembly (col. 3, lines 67-68 and col. 4, lines 1-23). Pamer et al. does not disclose a slug sensor located beneath the panel for sensing if the slug has been pierced from the panel and has been ejected from the pierce nut installation apparatus. However Krcek et al. teaches a slug ejector and a slug sensor for sensing if a slug has been pierced from a part and has been ejected from an apparatus, see column 3, lines 21-26 and column 8, lines 22-30. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided a slug sensor located beneath the panel for sensing if the slug has been pierced from the panel and has been ejected from the pierce nut installation apparatus in the apparatus of Pamer et al., in light of the teachings of Krcek et al., in order to provide a highly efficient and reliable way of ensuring that a slug is pierced and ejected from the pierce nut installation apparatus.

Regarding claim 29, see die button 24a in the figures of Pamer et al..

Regarding claims 30, 31, 33-35, 40 and 46, Applicant should note that the location of the slug sensor is an obvious matter of design choice as long as the slug sensor effectively senses if a slug has been pierced from a panel and has been ejected from the pierce nut installation apparatus.

Regarding claims 37 and 43, see column 4, lines 13-16 of Pamer et al.

Regarding claim 45, see column 8, lines 22-30 of Krcek et al.

4. Claims 32, 36, 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamer et al./Krcsek et al. as applied to claims 28 and 34 above, and further in view of Baker et al. (US Patent 5,455,848).

Pamer et al./Krcsek et al. disclose a pierce nut installation apparatus as shown above except for specifically disclosing the slug sensor being an electric current sensor or a conductive magnetic field generating sensor. However Baker et al. teaches slug sensors that could be any type of known sensors, see column 4, lines 39-46. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used an electric current sensor or a conductive magnetic field generating sensor in the apparatus of Pamer et al./Krcsek et al., in light of the teachings of Baker et al., as is known in the art.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 28-41 and 43-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ESSAMA OMGBA whose telephone number is (571)272-4532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6:30, 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Essama Omgba/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3726

eo
June 4, 2011